

Serial No.: 10/614,140

Docket No.: LOCH1

Amendment dated May 19, 2005

Responsive to Office Action dated May 5, 2005

REMARKS

Prior to the present Office Action, claims 1-24 were pending, with claims 8 and 19 being withdrawn as being drawn to a non-elected species. Claims 2-3, 7, and 24 have been canceled, and claims 25-28 added. Therefore, claims 1, 4-6, 8-23, and 25-28 remain pending.

5 The undersigned would like to thank Examiner Novosad for a courteous and productive telephonic interview on May 19, 2005. During the interview, the differences between claims 12 and 20 (as amended) were discussed.

Please note that aside from amending claims to place them in condition for allowance, claim 12 is not amended other than to correct a section 112 issue, and claim 20 has been amended 10 to incorporate the limitations of claim 24. Therefore, no new issues are raised and these amendments are proper in view of the final status of the Office Action.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the allowability of claims 3 and 9, and these have been converted into independent claims 1 and 25, respectively. Accordingly, claims 2-3 have been canceled. Furthermore, claim 7 has been canceled as being inconsistent with amended claim 1.

15 New claims 26-28 depend from claim 25 and therefore should be allowable.

Discussion of Section 112 Rejections

Claims 1, 12, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant understands the Examiner's rejection to relate to an antecedent problem as 20 to the terms "width dimension" and "width" in reference to either the support members or the skateboard. In the claims, a skateboard is defined as having a "deck width," while the support members are defined as having a "width dimension." To further clarify and respond to the rejection, several instances of "width dimension" have been amended such that they more expressly referred to the support member(s). For example, in claim 12 "the support members 25 [are] mounted in parallel a distance apart perpendicular to their width dimensions the width dimension" This explanation and the above changes are believed to sufficiently overcome the section 112 rejection.